Exhibit 1

Page 1

UNITED STATES DI DISTRICT OF	
TESLA, INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION,))
PLAINTIFF, Vs.) CASE NO.) 3:18-CV-00296-LRH-CBC)
MARTIN TRIPP, AN INDIVIDUAL, DEFENDANT.)))
MARTIN TRIPP, AN INDIVIDUAL,)))
COUNTERCLAIMANT, TESLA, INC., A DELAWARE)))
CORPORATION, COUNTERDEFENDANT.)))
CONFIDE	
(Pursuant to agreement of control of transcript has been de	
EXPERT DEPOSITION OF J	
TAKEN THURSDAY, I LOS ANGELES, C.	
Depo Dynamics, LLC (888) 494-3370	
Reported by Alejandria E. Job No. 1	

Page 2

1	INTTED STATES DIS	TRICT COURT					
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA						
3	DISTRICT OF .	NEVADA					
4	TESLA, INC., A DELAWARE)						
5	CORPORATION,)						
	PLAINTIFF,	CASE NO.					
6	vs.)	3:18-CV-00296-LRH-CBC					
7) MARTIN TRIPP, AN INDIVIDUAL,)						
8							
9	DEFENDANT.)						
10) MARTIN TRIPP, AN INDIVIDUAL,)						
11	COUNTERCLAIMANT,)						
12	TESLA, INC., A DELAWARE) CORPORATION,)						
13) COUNTERDEFENDANT.)						
14)						
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21	DEPOSITION OF JEFFREY H. KI						
22	OF THE DEFENDANT, AT 9:44 A.M.,						
23	523 WEST 6TH STREET, SUITE 400,						
24	BEFORE ALEJANDRIA E. KATE, C.S.R	. NO. 11897, PURSUANT TO					
25	NOTICE.						

Page 3

```
1
                       APPEARANCES:
 2
 3
     ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT COUNTERCLAIMANT MARTIN TRIPP:
 4
          TIFFANY & BOSCO P.A.
          BY: WILLIAM M. FISCHBACH III, ESQUIRE
 5
          2525 EAST CAMELBACK ROAD
          PHOENIX AZ 85016
          602.255.6000
 6
          wmf@tblaw.com
 7
 8
     ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF AND COUNTERDEFENDANT
 9
     TESLA, INC.:
10
          HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP
          BY: ALLISON LIBEU, ESQUIRE
               STEPHEN RICHARDS, ESQUIRE
11
          523 WEST 6TH STREET
12
          SUITE 400
          LOS ANGELES CA 90014
          949.273.4153
13
          alibeu@hueston.com
14
          srichards@hueston.com
15
16
     ALSO PRESENT:
17
          JEFFREY LOPEZ, Videographer
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 it's not going to change my answer. The question 2 doesn't -- I don't understand what that has to do 3 with my prior answer, which is what I think you 4 were responding to. 5 If I'm wrong, you may try it again. BY MR. FISCHBACH: 6 7 0. Did the three indices that you identified, 8 did they finish up or down that day? 9 I don't know. It wouldn't matter. Α. 10 0. Why would it not matter? 11 For all the reasons I described just a few Α. 12 answers ago, that whatever happens before the 13 19 minutes is sunk, it's moot. If the market 14 skyrocketed or plummeted before then, you don't 15 It doesn't affect what is happening at that care. 16 point. 17 All right. Did you do any analysis to Ο. 18 determine whether or not the Tesla stock price correlated with either the NASDAQ or the NASDAQ 19 20 Automotive Index for, say, June 5 to June 11? 21 I did not, nor would it have any 22 relevance. But the answer is no, I did not. 23 So, well, you told me before that looking Ο. 24 at what happened before publication was irrelevant; 25 is that right?

A. Yes.

- Q. Now you're telling me what happened after publication is also irrelevant?
- A. Not after immediately, that's why we do
 the 19 minutes to the end of the business day. But
 what happens a day later or two days later or five
 days later is irrelevant.
 - Q. What -- what are you basing that on?
 - A. Efficient markets.
- Q. Okay. Explain that, please. I -- I'm familiar with the theory, but explain that. If I'm a juror and I'm a retired schoolteacher, explain that theory to me and how it factors into your opinion.
- A. A stock that's widely covered and widely -- I'll leave it at covered, like Tesla, because Tesla has a lot of people who are -- a lot of analysts who follow it and a lot of investors in it, incorporates changes in information quite quickly.

So the kind of information that comes out, whether it's an Elon Musk tweet, or a public earnings announcement, or a leak from Tripp, because Tesla is trading efficiently, it would be expected to be incorporated quite quickly.

And so the time period immediately after a disclosure is where you would expect to find the information. By the time you get to the next business day, they would already be incorporated.

And equally relevant, perhaps even more relevant, other news, other information then interferes -- "interferes" is the wrong word, but also occurs. And so you can no longer distinguish the influences of the various causes. That's why the short period matters.

But over a long period of time, I mean, the next day, as I recall, was the stockholders' meeting. And certainly the influence of the stockholders' meeting would have a lot to -- would be fairly, and if you look at it, you'd see that it probably was.

So it's -- it's a distinguished -- sorry, I spoke poorly. You can distinguish the causation elements and can no longer identify any influence for the earlier news. But that would already have been incorporated anyway.

- Q. You don't have a causation opinion in this case; correct?
- A. I don't have an ultimate conclusion.

 I've -- as I said before, I've attempted to rule

out some things that would be potential causes, and I think I've succeeded in that.

But I have not drawn the conclusion that the entire 20 cents was caused by the disclosure from Mr. Tripp, though it's not inconsistent with what I've been able to find.

Q. Going back to the issue of efficient markets.

What, in your opinion, is the appropriate amount of -- what was the appropriate window to track the change in Tesla's stock price following the publication of the article?

A. It's not a predetermined amount. It depends on issues about news coverage and disclosures and whether there are other intervening but unrelated events.

In this case, tracking through the end of the stock market close made sense.

The opening the next morning was already influenced by this potentially, and by other news events that had occurred about Tesla in the intervening time, there were other news events.

And so you can no longer track it after that.

Q. What other news events occurred between the publication of the first Business Insider

1	article on June 4th and when Tesla opened up for
2	regular trading on June 5th of 2018?
3	A. I don't remember. Just that they were
4	there.
5	Q. Suppose the Business Insider article had
6	come out one minute after trading had opened on
7	June 4th, would you examine the stock price for the
8	entire trading day as part of your analysis?
9	MS. LIBEU: Incomplete hypothetical.
10	THE WITNESS: You might look at it. It
11	depends on what else happens. If there was other
12	news later in the day, that might be something you
13	cut off and you say, "I can no longer isolate the
14	impact of this event."
15	So you'd have to look at the underlying
16	facts and circumstances to decide what the
17	appropriate time period is.
18	Quite often on these kind of studies, an
19	entire day is relevant, but that assumes that the
20	only relevant news that came out is the item you're
21	studying.
22	Q. According to Exhibit 5 of your report, the
23	price of Tesla stock just before the publication of
24	the first Business Insider article on June 4 was

25

\$296.94; correct?

to extend before the event, that goes to the whole day, for example, would be a clear error in methodology.

- Q. But you said "any other time period."

 So, for example, what if the time period was from 19 minutes before the close of trading on June 4 to 24 hours after that?
 - A. Yes, that would also be an error.
 - O. Why?

- A. Because of the intervening events. The other news that has come out about Tesla during that time period.
 - Q. What about 12 hours?
- A. Well, anything that passes the end of the close, the market close would be -- let me back up.

After the market closed, the data in the overnight trading is usually pretty lousy and is not usually a good indicator of meaningful prices, the volume is too low, the liquidity is bad, so that's just a general principle.

Unless you need to do something during the after-hours time, usually you ignore it.

So what we're really talking about is the next day. And the next day, we already have news out, so it's confounded and you can't learn much at

that point.

- Q. So you're saying the only appropriate time period has to be between when the article was published and when the market closed at 4:00 p.m.?
- A. Given these facts. There are other cases where that isn't true. There are other cases when the only meaningful event is the event at issue and the whole day may be relevant.

In other words, maybe it came out before the market opened, there's no other meaningful information during the day and so the entire day's stock price change is a meaningful measure.

So it's case by case, but given these facts and given that the information didn't come out until late in the day, the answer is yes.

I can't see another period. I certainly can't see a period that includes the next day when you had a stockholders' meeting and you had significant news about that coming out the next day.

Q. Okay. But going back, I think this started up on me asking you if a 12-hour period would be appropriate.

And what's your answer on that? Is it no because it's after the close of trading on

Page 168

June 4th?

A. Yeah, you don't have any meaningful data between close of business -- close of trading and the open the next morning, so there's nothing there to rely on.

If I had good trading data and the market was active, then I might be able to do something with that time, but that doesn't exist.

- Q. Would it be appropriate to use a period of, say, the last 19 minutes of regular trading on June 4th and the first hour of after-hours trading?
- A. No, because most after-hours stuff is really bad. I mean, just data-wise, it's really bad. You get very little market participations. The volume typically declines by 100 fold.

Obviously, I don't know the particulars here, but it's not uncommon to see 100-fold decline in market volume.

And so you no longer get the efficient market and liquidity expectations that you have during the times the market was open.

Q. All right. Going back to the Schulz report.

So you take issue with his critique of the time period you selected.

Page 198

(ר	F.	R	Т	Т	F	Т	\sim	Δ	т	F.

I, ALEJANDRIA E. KATE, a certified court

reporter in the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing deposition of

JEFFREY H. KINRICH was taken before me at the time and place therein set forth, at which time the witness was duly sworn by me;

That the testimony of the witness and all colloquy and objections made at the time of the deposition were recorded stenographically by me and thereafter transcribed, said transcript being a true copy of my shorthand notes thereof;

I further certify I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney or any of the parties.

In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name and signature this date, May 17, 2019.

uilatalli (.

ALEJANDRIA E. KATE California Certificate No. 11897 Illinois Certificate No. 084.004797